

REMARKS

Claims 1-44 are pending and at issue in the application with claims 1 and 24 being independent claims. Claims 1 and 24 have been amended. As a result, 2 independent claims remain in the application as previously paid for, and 44 total claims remain in the application as previously paid for. This response is being timely filed with a two-month extension of time and fee of \$450.00. The applicants believe no additional fee is due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the amount enclosed or any additional fees which may be required under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 13-2855. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the remarks below is respectfully requested.

The action rejects claims 1-4, 7-9, 15-18, 23-25, 27-30, 32-35 and 41-43 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Spriggs et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,889,096), and rejects claims 5, 6, 10-14, 20, 21, 31, 36-40 and 44 as unpatentable over Spriggs et al. in view of Kall et al. (U.S. Application Publication 2003/0149608). The applicants respectfully traverse the rejections in light of the above amendments and the remarks below.

Each of claims 1-44 recites a remote data viewing system or a method of viewing entity data collected or generated by a plurality of data source applications. The system or method includes a display of a navigational tree and a display view. The navigational tree includes selectable sections specifying different categories of entity data. Entity data associated with a selected section is presented in the display view in a predetermined format. Independent claims 1 and 24 have been amended to clarify that the predetermined format is a common display format for presenting entity data of each of the sections, whereas data source applications present the same entity data in different formats.

While different data source applications collect or generate entity data, they are typically designed to be used in a process plant to perform very different functions, often associated with a subset of entities within the plant. The data source applications are therefore developed to organize and provide viewing of the entity data in different formats. While the applications may share the data, the use of different formats complicates efforts to organize the shared data in a manner that presents the data in an organized and easily

understood manner. Accordingly, claims 1-44 provide a system and method whereby entity data from different data source applications may be viewed, such that the entity data is organized into a predetermined common format, even though the entity data may be collected and organized in different manners by different data sources.

Spriggs et al. do not disclose or suggest a display that presents entity data in a predetermined common format, where the entity data is collected or generated by data source applications that present the entity data in different formats. Although Spriggs et al. discloses a system and method of gathering information from multiple sources and providing a graphical user interface that provides different views of the plant and assets therein, Spriggs et al. does not disclose that the multiple sources have different formats to present the data, such that the graphical user interface takes the entity data, which is presented in the different formats, and presents the entity data in a predetermined common display format.

In particular, Spriggs et al. discloses that a data acquisition module 20 includes data collector modules 50 which collect data from data acquisition devices or systems 60, and a display module 100 that displays the collected data. Spriggs et al. further discloses that the data acquisition devices or systems 60 may include software applications. (See column 8, lines 21-63; Fig. 1). However, Spriggs et al. does not further disclose, or suggest, that the software applications of the data acquisition devices or systems 60 present the data they acquire in different formats. Indeed, Spriggs et al. does not disclose that the data acquisition devices or systems 60 present the data in any manner. Instead, the only format associated with the data acquisition devices or systems 60 is that of the display module 100 (i.e., the graphical user interface 102), which is the same format used for all of the data acquisition devices or systems 60. (See column 2, lines 31-42; Figs. 1, 3, 6, 7-14, 17, 18 and 20-27). Simply put, Spriggs et al. provides a system that does not take into account data source applications that have their own presentation format, but instead provides a system with data sources that do not have any associated format. As a result, while Spriggs et al. provides a “single unified display environment” (column 2, lines 41-42), Spriggs et al. does not do so on the basis of entity data from multiple data source applications that each have their own display format. As a further result, Spriggs et al. does not address the problem of different display formats complicating efforts to organize shared data, much less the solution provided

Appln. No. 10/801,195
Amdt. Dated June 25, 2007
Reply to Non-Final Official Action dated January 23, 2007

by claims 1-44, which collects data from data source applications that present the entity data in different formats, and is capable of displaying the entity data in a predetermined common format, unlike the system of Spriggs et al.

Kall et al. also does not disclose or suggest that a gaming apparatus or slot machine remains operable when a removable storage memory is removed, nor has Kall et al. been cited for this purpose.

The applicants respectfully submit that the remarks presented herein have placed the application in condition for allowance. As such, independent claims 1 and 24 are believed to be in allowable form. Further, dependent claims 2-23 and 25-44 which are dependent upon the aforementioned independent claims are also submitted to be in allowable form.

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims and allowance thereof are respectfully requested. Should the examiner wish to discuss the foregoing, or any matter of form, in an effort to advance this application towards allowance, the examiner is urged to telephone the undersigned at the indicated number.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive
6300 Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300

By: _____

Aaron M. Peters
Registration No.: 48,801
Attorney for Applicants

June 25, 2007